24th February 1930]

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Notice has been taken by Government of the delay on the part of the District Judge concerned.

Selection of District Munsifs.

*1438 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of candidates who applied for the post of District Munsif from Madras City and the mufassal last year;

(*b*) how many of these were Brahmans, non-Brahmans, Muslims and Christians respectively;

(*c*) how many candidates were selected from Madras City and the mufassal and how many of these belong to each of the communities mentioned in (*b*); and

(*d*) whether the High Court has ever communicated to the Government the principles on which the selection was made?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*c*) A statement[a] is appended.

(*d*) Yes.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"With reference to answer to clause (*d*) may I know the principles on which the High Court has made the selection?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"The High Court have stated that they make the selection on the basis of efficiency, and consistently with efficiency they observe, as far as possible, the principle of communal representation."

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"May I now why only 13 candidates were selected from the mufassal, while 17 were selected out of a smaller number of candidates from the city?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I am sorry, I cannot answer that question. The Government have no hand in selecting the candidates. The matter is entirely in the hands of the High Court."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, the hon. the Law Member said that the High Court has said that consistently with efficiency it would observe the rules regarding communal representation. May I know if it is anything different from that governing other departments?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I want notice. I am not in a position to answer with regard to all other departments."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"What about your department?"

Selection of District Munsifs.

*1439 *Q.*—Mr. J. A. DAVIS: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are aware that recently the High Court selected 30 candidates for the post of District Munsif, and that of the candidates selected, as many as 17 were of one community now preponderating the Judicial service;

---

[a] Printed as Appendix I on page 141 infra.

(b) whether there were not a sufficient number of qualified candidates of other communities available ;

(c) what was the number of qualified candidates of each of the following communities, Muhammadans, Indian Christians and Anglo-Indians ;

(d) whether it is a fact that there were not less than three qualified Anglo-Indian candidates and that two of them at least were recommended by the District Judges of the districts in which they were practising as pleaders and none was selected ;

(e) whether seeing that the Anglo-Indian candidates will most probably be age-barred when the next selection takes place, the Government will be pleased to request the High Court to reconsider the case of the Anglo-Indian candidates ; and

(f) whether Government will also see that steps are taken to give effect to the communal Government Order in regard to the Judicial service ?

A.—(a) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 1438.

(b) Yes. The preponderence of one community is reported to be due to the fact that the possible candidates for appointment from the staff (High Court and mufassal) were of that community.

(c)

Muhammadans	8
Indian Christians	12
Anglo-Indians	3

(d) The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative and the answer to the second part is that the reports of District Judges are confidential. The reason why no Anglo-Indian candidate was selected in 1929, is reported to be that one candidate was selected from the Anglo-Indian community in each of the years 1926 and 1927 although the number of candidates from that community was almost negligible.

(e) The appointment of District Munsifs is, by law, vested in the High Court.

(f) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 1378.

Disposal of suits filed under the Hindu Religious Endowments Act.

* 1440 *Q.*—Mr. P. T. Rajan: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the number of original suits and petitions so far filed, disposed of and pending under the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act in the District Courts of Ganjam, East Godavari, West Godavari, Guntur, North Malabar, South Malabar and South Kanara ;

(b) the reasons for the non-disposal of the above suits and petitions which have been filed more than two years ago ; and

(c) what steps Government propose to take to see that these suits and petitions are disposed of at an early date ?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have no information, but have called for it.